

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

ROBERT M. TAYLOR,

Plaintiff,

vs.

KRISTEN CLARKE and TERESA A. MOORE,

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Case No. 24-cv-03010-MDH

ORDER

Defendant has filed a Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction. (Doc. 4). Defendants' motion moves to dismiss this case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and/or for failure to state a claim for which relief may be granted. Defendants' motion also moves to dismiss this action for lack of personal jurisdiction and insufficient service of process.

On April 2, 2024, the Court entered an Order directing Plaintiff to either file a return of service indicating service has been made pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 or file a status report informing the Court of his attempts to serve Defendants pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4. Plaintiff was ordered to file this on or before April 19, 2024. To date, Plaintiff has not filed a response.

On May 7, 2024, the Court ordered Plaintiff to file a response to Defendant's motion or file an update regarding his attempt to obtain proper service on Defendant with the Court. Plaintiff was ordered to file his response no later than May 20, 2024. To date, Plaintiff has not filed a response.

Plaintiff's *pro se* Complaint states: this is an "Action to compel an officer of the United States to perform her duty" against Kristen Clarke, Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division of the United States Department of Justice; and Teresa Moore, United States Attorney for the Western District of Missouri. Plaintiff's allegations and causes of action arise out of what

he alleges are violations of his rights at a dog park. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges the Greene County ADA Coordinator has applied a breed-specific Springfield, Missouri, ordinance that Plaintiff's service dog, a pit bull, may not be off-leash in an off-leash dog park. Plaintiff alleges that these actions violate his disability rights under various statutes.

The Court has reviewed the motion to dismiss and taking Plaintiff's allegations in a light most favorable to him, finds the motion to dismiss well taken. Further, Plaintiff has failed to respond to the Court's orders regarding the status of service on Defendants or a response to the motion to dismiss. Wherefore, for the reasons set forth in Defendants' motion to dismiss and Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's prior Orders the Court hereby **GRANTS** the motion to dismiss and dismisses this case without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: July 8, 2024

/s/ Douglas Harpool
DOUGLAS HARPOOL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE